

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action mailed September 21, 2004, Applicants amend their application and request reconsideration. In this Amendment, no claims are added and claims 2 and 5 are canceled, so that claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the invention stores a data structure for determining web page access rights associated with a plurality of user identifiers, the data structure including, for each user identifier, a password, web page identifiers, and an indicator for each web page identifier indicating whether a web page associated with each web page identifier is readable by a user having the user identifier and whether the web page is changeable by a user having the user identifier (see Table 1 of the patent application).

The Official Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 as anticipated by Salas et al. (US Patent 6,233,600, hereinafter Salas). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Salas fails to teach every limitation of amended claims 1 and 4. Namely, Salas fails to teach *storing a data structure for determining web page access rights associated with a plurality of user identifiers, the data structure including, for each user identifier, a password, web page identifiers, and an indicator for each web page identifier indicating whether a web page associated with each web page identifier is readable by a user having the user identifier and whether the web page is changeable by a user having the user identifier*. The access control data structure of Salas is discussed at column 14, lines 30-54. There, Salas discloses an access control table that is clearly different from the presently claimed invention. The access control table of Salas merely associates for each user a permission group for each eRoom (see column 14, lines 39-44 of Salas). Thus, a user in the “reader” group for a particular eRoom may view but not edit all eRoom items (files). A user in the “participant” group may view and edit all eRoom items. Notably, however, the table of Salas does not store a permission level for each individual file in the eRoom. That is, Salas does not store for each user *an indicator for each web page identifier indicating whether a web page [file, eRoom item] associated with each web page identifier is readable by a user having the user identifier and whether the web page [file, eRoom item] is changeable by a user having the user identifier*. Access control checks are made only on a per eRoom basis, not a per eRoom file basis (see column 14, lines 50-54 of Salas).

Furthermore, because Salas does not store access control information on a per web page basis, Salas cannot teach *determining whether a user having the user identifier received from the terminal is allowed to read and change a requested web page, wherein*

In re Appln. of TAKAMOTO et al.
Application No. 09/836,180

said determination is made for every requested web page. Once the user is permitted into the eRoom, that user is permitted to access all items with the same predetermined permission level (see column 14, lines 50-54 of Salas). Still further, that determination is made upon entry to the eRoom, not for every requested web page, as claimed in the present invention (see column 14, lines 50-54 of Salas).

Thus, Salas fails to teach every limitation of amended claims 1 and 4. Moreover, because Salas lacks the claimed features, Salas cannot achieve the fine granularity of web page access control provided by the invention without increased burden on the user. Accordingly, the rejection of amended claims 1 and 4 based on Salas is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Official Action rejected claims 3 and 6 as unpatentable over Salas in view of Boyd et al. (US Patent 6,112,238, hereinafter Boyd). That rejection is respectfully traversed. The rejection of claims 3 and 6 relies on the assertion that Salas anticipates amended claims 1 and 4. As previously discussed, Salas cannot anticipate amended claims 1 and 4, and therefore the rejection of claims 3 and 6 is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Wesley Ferrebee, Reg. 51,312
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: 12/13/04